

REGULAR MEETING – WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 2009  
ATRIUM CONFERENCE ROOM AT CITY HALL – 500 CASTRO STREET  
6:30 P.M.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Siegel.

2. **ROLL CALL**

**Committee Members Present:** Ronit Bryant and Chair Jac Siegel.

**Committee Member Absent:** Margaret Abe-Koga.

**City Staff Present:** Joan Jenkins, Transportation and Policy Manager; Lori Topley, Solid Waste Program Manager; and Steve Attinger, Environmental Sustainability Coordinator.

3. **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC—None.**

4. **MINUTES APPROVAL**

Minutes of the December 15, 2008 and January 26, 2009 CESC meetings were approved 2-0; Abe-Koga absent.

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

5.1 **COMMUNITY-WIDE GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORY AND EMISSIONS REDUCTION TARGETS**

Staff presented results of the City's recently completed community-wide greenhouse gas inventory and long-term greenhouse gas reduction targets for consideration by the Council. The City completed an inventory of its 2005 community-wide emissions in conjunction with ICLEI. This 2005 inventory will serve as a baseline year against which the City will measure its future emission reductions.

The next step to meeting AB 32 requirements is setting GHG reduction targets. The City's targets can be modified at any time based on measured results and/or economic and environmental considerations. At least 50 California cities have set or are setting reduction targets.

Staff recommends the following community-wide GHG reduction targets which meet or exceed both AB 32 requirements and ESTF recommendations:

- 5 percent reduction below 2005 levels by 2012.
- 10 percent reduction below 2005 levels by 2015.
- A range of 15 percent to 20 percent reduction below 2005 levels by 2020.
- 80 percent reduction below 2005 levels by 2050.

A GHG reduction program is currently being developed as part of the General Plan update and will include emission reduction policies and actions to help the City reach these targets.

#### Committee Comments

In response to a question about the City's government operations emissions, staff noted that it will be reviewed by the Committee in November and the reduction targets may be more aggressive than the community targets.

A Committee member questioned how the base emissions were calculated. Staff explained the modeling is based on a number of assumptions—for example, average miles per gallon per passenger vehicle and average miles per gallon for other types of vehicles, gasoline versus diesel, etc. MTC has transportation models that predict—based on actual Caltrans counts—vehicle miles traveled.

A Committee member asked how population growth is considered; are emissions and targets normalized to account for this? Staff explained that the reduction targets are regardless of population growth. If population is growing, that needs to be considered when deciding how to meet the targets.

The Committee discussed how little control the City has over transportation, and staff clarified that every vehicle trip that goes through Mountain View is counted as our emissions, so if the number of vehicles traveling through Mountain View can be reduced, we get credit for that. There are regional efforts under way, such as the Low Carbon Fuel Standard and a State-wide initiative called the Tire Pressure Program that will reduce our emissions community-wide without our having to do anything.

The Committee requested staff provide additional information about the emissions methodology and the important reasons for emissions reductions when the recommendations go forward to Council.

### Public Input

William Ware commented on the importance of alternative fuel vehicles.

John Carpenter asked why the AB 32 base emissions is 1990 and the City's is 2005.

Julie Lovins commented on the merits of several of the potential emission reduction programs listed in Attachment 2.

David Paradise said we need to use stronger language to explain why these goals are important. They need to come with a sense of urgency.

Bruce Karney stated that passing environmental problems and climate change to the next generations is particularly unjust, and he recommends aggressive goals. He is pleased the City is within a couple of weeks of having explicit goals and hopes the Council will consider a referendum to find out just how far citizens of Mountain View are willing to go to mitigate our GHG emissions as soon as possible.

Aileen LaBouff expressed support by Green Mountain View toward reduction in GHG emissions. She also urged an aggressive Zero Waste target.

Ellie Casson feels the targets seem somewhat abstract, noting Oakland and San Jose's efforts to try and determine how much they really need to reduce to be sustainable rather than just using the same numbers as everyone else. She also stated the City may not have much direct control over VMTs, but they have far more control than the region or State in reducing emissions through the design of their community, specifically through housing choices.

### Committee Discussion

In response to public input, staff clarified that Attachment 2 is simply a sample of strategies that the General Plan consultant working on the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program suggested—some more specific to Mountain View, some not as specific—and is based on their work with other cities. Nothing is recommended at this point. A full list of reduction programs will be presented to and reviewed by the Council at a later date and will be available for public review at that time.

In response to a question, staff replied that the AB 32 1990 baseline is from the Kyoto Boards, noting it is not possible for Mountain View to calculate emissions this far back, so the Air Board has approved the use of 2005.

A Committee member commented that a lot of technical knowledge went into creating AB 32 emissions targets, so we should accept them and spend our time achieving those levels.

Another Committee member stated the Council may make tradeoffs when evaluating reduction programs and costs due to limited dollars to work with. Mountain View will evaluate what we can do in terms of land use decisions and how to work toward a greater jobs/housing balance.

The Committee members discussed how the absolute value of the emission numbers is not important because we cannot know exactly what they are. The methodology used to calculate them and the assumptions used is what is important and should remain consistent.

Committee member Bryant moved to recommend to the City Council adoption of the following community-wide GHG emission reduction targets to meet or exceed AB 32 requirements:

- 5 percent below 2005 levels by 2012.
- 10 percent below 2005 levels by 2015.
- 15 percent to 20 percent below 2005 levels by 2020.
- 80 percent below 2005 level by 2050.

The motion was seconded by Chair Siegel. The motion passed 2-0; Abe-Koga absent.

## **5.2 BAY-FRIENDLY LANDSCAPING AND GARDENING PROGRAM**

Staff explained this item is on the agenda at the request of Councilmember Bryant. The staff report provides background information about the program which was started in 2001 by *StopWaste.org* in Alameda County. It is based on principles of sustainable gardening that can help residents, landscapers and public agencies to ensure they are landscaping in a sustainable way, including water, waste reduction and toxic controls. The program covers seven principles.

There is a collaborative effort under way in Santa Clara County to bring the Bay-Friendly Program here. The ABAG Executive Board recently endorsed this program and is urging member cities to do the same and find ways to incorporate the principles into local policies and programs.

#### Committee Comments

A Committee member asked if there is information available to quantify what the return on putting resources into this program might be. Staff indicated such information might be available.

In response to questions about whether money for a staff allocation is needed, staff indicated there are different ways to support the collaborative, such as assign staff time or make monetary contributions, which are optional.

A Committee member noted that this program will support the forthcoming landscape water conservation ordinance.

#### Public Input

Julie Lovins stated one of the goals in adopting Bay-friendly principles is to influence everything the City did in this area. She believes this is an excellent area for citizen involvement and that public/private partnerships will be needed.

David Paradise thinks the principles sound great and seem like something the City could endorse. He suggested providing information about how successful the program has been to date.

Larry Moore asked if anything is being done to allow the use of collected rain water and gray water for landscaping. In response, staff noted the State-wide rules on gray water have been changed and Mountain View allows collection and use of it.

Ellie Casson was surprised to learn that indoor water use accounts for only 10 percent of water consumption, noting that savings in water use would be reflected by adopting these principles.

#### Committee Discussion

A Committee member stated she would very much like Mountain View to endorse these seven principles. She believes educating people is a critical aspect of our GHG reduction program and the City needs to give these principles visibility. Adopting the principles is a first, painless step we

should take. She would also be interested in staff finding out what other things we could do with this organization for the least amount of money. She suggested staff provide some assessment of what it would take for Mountain View to be more involved.

Another Committee member noted that the principles are really common sense, yet people do not seem to understand it. The nurseries just sell whatever people want instead of encouraging low-water-use plants.

The Committee asked about possibly teaching the Bay-friendly classes in Mountain View. Staff responded it is being researched. A Committee member reminded that budget issues are substantial and may preclude being able to support this.

One Committee member questioned whether endorsement of the principles should wait until staff can provide more information about how much Mountain View can support this. He was concerned about "backing" an organization without more information. It was decided to go ahead and recommend Council endorse the principles now as that costs no money and does not require supporting any organization, but sends a message that the principles should be incorporated into everything the City and public do related to landscaping.

Committee member Bryant moved to recommend Council adopt the seven principles of Bay-Friendly Landscaping and Gardening and asked staff to provide more information about the Bay-Friendly Coalition and possible ways for Mountain View to support and/or obtain assistance for this organization.

The motion was seconded by Chair Siegel. The motion passed 2-0; Abe-Koga absent.

## **6. COMMITTEE/STAFF COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND REPORTS**

Committee member Bryant referred to the memorandum in the packet about the Library Greening project and asked that it be given some visibility—for example, on the web site and at the Library. Let the public know about how we are working to green our facilities.

Committee member Siegel thanked Green Mountain View for their effort at the Art and Wine Festival and indicated a proclamation is being prepared to recognize them.

**7. SET DATE AND TIME FOR NEXT MEETING**

Staff inquired about setting a meeting date in November to discuss the government operations target and to update the Committee on single-use bags issues. November 2 was identified as a date to work toward.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

LT/2/PWK  
944-10-07-09mn-E^